REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the First Office Action dated June 14, 2005. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the patent application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111.

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-2, 6-10 and 17-25 are pending in the application. The amendments do not introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Restriction Requirement

Applicants affirm the election without traverse that was made by Thomas R. Beall on May 26, 2005 to prosecute Claims 1-10, 17-21 and 22-24 (Group I).

Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

Claim 20 was objected to because of two informalities.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2) in view of Akao (US 4,906,517).

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2) in view of Akao (US 4,906,517).

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell (US 2,556,529) in view of Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barger (EP Patent Application 0311425 A2).

Summary of Amendment

Applicants have canceled Claims 3-5 and 11-16 (without prejudice),amended Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, 17-20 and 22-24, and added Claim 25 to more particularly define the present invention.

Remarks regarding objected Claim 20

Claim 20 was objected because of two informalities where the word "or" was missing between "film" and "other" in two places. Applicants have amended Claim 20 to address these two informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

Remarks regarding § 103(a) rejections

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 is not taught by Barger. The claimed invention as recited in independent Claim 1 follows:

> 1. A glass sheet comprising:
> a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
> a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein at least one of the top protective film and bottom protective film has patterned embossed features formed therein (emphasis on main distinguishing limitation).

The teachings of Barger differ significantly from the present invention as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Claim 1 now recites a glass sheet that has at least one surface which is covered with a protective film that has patterned embossed features formed therein (see FIGURES 1B, 2B, 2C, 3B and 3C). Barger does not disclose this limitation. Instead, Barger discloses where a rigid but pliable, smooth surface is covered with a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film (e.g., see abstract and col. 4, lines 23-25). As can be seen, the amended independent Claim 1 recites a protective film that has patterned embossed features formed therein. And, Barger discloses a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film. These are not the same configurations. In fact, Barger teaches away from the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection and allowance of amended independent Claim 1 and it' associated dependent claims.

Referring to amended dependent Claim 7, Applicants submit that Barger does not teach the following limitation "wherein the patterned embossed features on said top protective film have a different shape or are located in a different position than the patterned embossed features on said bottom protective film" (emphasis added). Again, Barger discloses a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film. It follows that Barger does not teach where the patterned embossed features have a different shape or are located in a different position on the top protective film when compared to the bottom protective film. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection and allowance of amended dependent 7.

Referring now to amended independent Claims 17 and 22, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 17 and 22 are patentable over Barger and/or Farrell. The claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 17 and 22 follows:

> 17. A container for holding a plurality of glass sheets, said container comprising:
> a first side;
> an opposing second side;
> two additional sides;
> a top; and
> a bottom all of which enclose said glass sheets, each glass sheet includes:
> a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
> a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein the glass sheets are stacked next to one another such that the top protective film of one glass sheet is adjacent to the bottom protective film of another glass sheet, wherein at least one of the top protective film and bottom protective film on each glass sheet has patterned embossed features therein which make it easier to separate one glass sheet from another glass sheet because of the presence of air pockets caused by the patterned embossed features located between said stacked glass sheets (emphasis on distinguishing limitations).

> 22. A material comprising:
> a top surface coated with a removable top protective film; and
> a bottom surface coated with a removable bottom protective film, wherein at least one of the top protective film and bottom protective film has patterned embossed features therein which make it easier to separate said material that is stacked on another piece of material because of the presence of air pockets caused by the patterned embossed features located between said stacked materials (emphasis on distinguishing limitations).

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Barger and/or Farrell differ significantly in several respects from the present invention as recited in amended Claims 17 and 22. First, the amended independent Claims 17 and 22 each recite the use of a protective film that has patterned embossed features formed therein (see FIGURES 1B, 2B, 2C, 3B and 3C). Barger does not disclose this limitation. Instead, Barger discloses the use of a one-sided random matte embossed polyethylene film (e.g., see abstract and col. 4, lines 23-25). This important difference was discussed above in detail with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

Secondly, the amended independent Claim 17 (for example) recites where "at least one of the top protective film and bottom protective film on each glass sheet has patterned embossed features therein which make it easier to separate one glass sheet from another glass sheet because of the presence of air pockets caused by the patterned embossed features located between said stacked glass sheets" (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Barger's one-sided random matte embossed polyethlyene film would not function in the claimed application because the random embossed features happen to be microscopic (see col. 4, lines 24-27). And, one skilled in the art would readily appreciate that if a random matte embossed

polyethylene film which had microscopic features where used to cover the glass sheet (or material of Claim 22) then the weight of stacked glass sheets (or materials of Claim 22) would prevent the formation of air pockets which are needed to make it easer to separate the glass sheets (or materials of Claim 22). In other words, the weight of the stacked glass sheets (or materials of Claim 22) would effectively put pressure on the embossed film and close the microscopic air spaces. To further support this conclusion, Barger discloses where the microscopic embossed film is used because it forms an air space between successive layers of film as it is turned onto a cylindrical roll. These air spaces make it easier to unroll the microscopic embossed film because they prevent the film from blocking on the cylindrical roll (see col. 4, lines 21-28 and lines 55-61). Of course, rolling a microscopic embossed film onto a cylindrical roll and unrolling that film is not the same as using the microscopic embossed film on stacked glass sheets (or stacked materials) to help with the separation of those glass sheets (or stacked materials). Farrell does not cure these defects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned differences between the Barger and Farrell references and the present invention are indicative of the patentability of the amended independent Claims 17 and 22 and their associated dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the amended independent Claims 17 and 22 and their associated dependent claims.

Referring now to amended independent Claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 8 is patentable over Barger and/or Akao. The claimed invention as recited in independent Claim 8 follows:

> 8. A glass sheet comprising:
> a top surface coated with a removable two-layer protective structure;
> a bottom surface coated with a removable protective later;
> wherein the removable two-layer protective structure includes a smooth layer which faces said top surface and a rough layer which faces away from said top surface (emphasis on distinguishing limitations).

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Barger and/or Akao differ significantly from the present invention as recited in the amended independent Claim 8. First, Claim 8 recites a removable two-layer protective structure that includes a smooth layer which faces a top surface of a glass sheet and a rough layer which faces away from the top surface of the glass sheet (see FIGURE 4A and elements 405a and 405b). In the Office Action, the Examiner contended that Barger discloses a multi-layer film comprising a smooth layer and a rough embossed layer. Applicants respectfully traverse this interpretation of Barger. Instead, Barger discloses where a matte embossed polyethylene film can be been used to cover one-side of a photopolymer (which has a consistency of jelly) and then the other side of the photopolymer is coated with a polyester film (see col. 3, lines 23-37). This is not like the two-layer protective structure recited in Claim 8. And, Akao does

not cure this defect. Instead, Akao discloses many different three-plus layered packaging films (see FIGURES 1-40) and just one two-layer packaging film which does not have a smooth layer and a rough layer as recited in independent Claim 8 (see col. 1, lines 11-42). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned differences between the Barger and Akao references and the present invention are indicative of the patentability of the amended independent Claim 8 and it's associated dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the independent Claim 8 and it's associated dependent claims.

Referring to amended dependent Claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Barger and/or Akao do not teach the claimed limitation where the polymer film (smooth layer) has a modulus of stiffness that is lower than a modulus of stiffness of the fabric or paper (rough layer). Again, Barger does not disclose a two-layer structure which includes a polymer film (smooth layer) and a fabric or paper (rough layer). And, Akao does not cure this defect. In fact, Akao teaches away from the present invention by disclosing a three-layer packaging film which happens to have a high Young's modulus thermoplastic layer and a flexible sheet layer (which can be a fabric) laminated thereon with an adhesive layer (see col. 15, lines 63-68, col. 6, lines 34-56 and FIGURE 10). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection and allowance of amended dependent 10.

Referring now to added independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that added independent Claim 25 is patentable over Barger and/or Akao. The claimed invention as recited in the added independent Claim 25 follows:

> 25. A glass sheet comprising:
> a top surface coated with a removable multi-layer protective structure;
> a bottom surface coated with a removable protective later;
> wherein the removable multi-layer protective structure includes a smooth layer which faces said top surface and a rough layer which faces away from said top surface;
> wherein said smooth layer is a polymer film and said rough layer is a layer of fabric or paper; and
> wherein said polymer film has a modulus of stiffness that is lower than a modulus of stiffness of said layer of fabric or paper (emphasis on distinguishing limitations).

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Barger and/or Akao differ significantly from the present invention as recited in added independent Claim 25. First, Claim 25 recites a removable multi-layer structure that includes a smooth layer which faces a top surface of a glass sheet and a rough layer which faces away from the top surface of the glass sheet (see FIGURE 4A and elements 405a and 405b). In the Office Action, the Examiner contended that Barger discloses a multi-layer film comprising a smooth layer and a rough embossed layer. Applicants respectfully traverse this interpretation of Barger. Instead, Barger discloses where a matte embossed polyethylene film can be used to cover one side of a photopolymer (which has a

consistency of jelly) and then the other side of the photopolymer can be coated with a polyester film (see col. 3, lines 23-37). This is not like the multi-layer structure recited in Claim 25. And, Akao does not teach the limitation where the polymer film (smooth layer) has a modulus of stiffness that is lower than a modulus of stiffness of the fabric or paper (rough layer). In fact, Akao teaches away from the present invention by disclosing a three-layer packaging film which has a high Young's modulus thermoplastic layer and a flexible sheet layer (which can be a fabric) laminated thereon through an adhesive layer (see col. 15, lines 63-68, col. 6, lines 34-56 and FIGURE 10). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned differences between the Barger and Akao references and the present invention are indicative of the patentability of the independent Claim 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the independent Claim 25.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been accommodated and rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of all outstanding objections and rejections and the allowance of pending Claims 1-2, 6-10 and 17-25.

Enclosed is a USPTO Credit Card Payment Form filled out for $ 400.00 to cover the fee for the addition of independent Claims 8 and 25. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-1481.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Tucker
Reg. No. 41,356
(903) 489-2198

Corning Incorporated
Attn: Thomas R. Beall, Esq.
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831